DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 967 JC 720 123

AUTHOR	Bender, Louis W.; Richardson, Richard C., Jr.
TITLE	Management Concepts and Higher Education Administration.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Dept. of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Center for State and Regional Leadership, Florida.
PUB DATE	May 72
NOTE	46p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Personnel; Administrative Principles; *Administrator Role; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Junior Colleges; Leadership Training; *Management Education; Private Colleges; Role Perception

ABSTRACT

A summer Management Institute supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation was held for administrative teams from 20 public and independent junior colleges. The 64 participants explored theories of management relating human behavior and motivation to organizational goals. The results of the Management Style Diagnosis Test, given on the first day, showed that: (1) the test is useful for motivating self-analysis in such training programs; (2) there is little evidence of differences between public and independent school administrative attitudes; (3) educational administrators are more likely than other occupational groups to have a high "relationships orientation" (emphasizing people); and (4) there are significant differences in role perceptions between administrators and presidents of independent colleges and also between administrators of public and independent colleges. From institute evaluations, it was concluded that administrators were interested enough to utilize some of these concepts in their own colleges, and that the summer institute was valuable. (RN)

ED 062967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MANAGEMENT CONCEPTS

AND

HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

By

Louis W. Bender
Professor of Higher Education
Florida State University

and

Richard C. Richardson, Jr.
President
Northampton County Area Community College

JC 120 123

Department of Higher Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

May, 1972

A publication of the Center for State and Regional Leadership
(Florida State University/University of Florida)
with the help of a grant from the
W. K. Kellogg Foundation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 20 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	v
PART ONE - ADMINISTRATORS REACT TO MANAGEMENT CONCEPTS	1
The Institute	2
The Institute Format	3
Selected Concepts Considered	4
The Surveys	6
Conclusions	11
Footnotes	12
PART TWO - MOTIVATION IN THE MANAGEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION	13
Footnotes	21
PART THREE - MANAGEMENT STYLES AMONG TWO-YEAR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS	22
Management Style Diagnosis Test	26
Management Style of Two-Year College Administrators	28
Footnotes	36

FOREWORD

Administration of an institution of higher education is viewed by some as an art while others insist that administration is a science which can be perfected as we learn more about its nature and intricate mysteries. Even the most cursory observation of the operation of colleges and universities today make it abundantly clear that administration is complex with many dimensions. External pressures upon the institution as well as internal pressures from within have made the work of the administrator most challenging, extremely demanding, but hopefully very exciting.

In an effort to learn more about the administrator's role, whether as an art or a science, educational scholars and practitioners have increasingly become interested in the evolution of management thought and practice. The historic assumption that management of business or industry enterprise could not be related to the administration of an educational institution has recently been questioned if not totally rejected. The three papers presented in this publication should prove interesting and thought-provoking to higher education administrators "on the firing line" as well as to those preparing to serve in that capacity.

Dr. Richard C. Richardson, Jr. served as resident consultant to the Management Institute described herein which was sponsored by

by the Southeastern Community College Leadership Program, a partnership activity of the Florida State University and the University of Florida supported in part by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Dr. Louis W. Bender assumed major responsibility for planning the 1971 Management Institute as part of the joint activity of the Southern Community College Leadership Program and is co-director with me of the S.C.C.L.P. and the FSU/UF Center for State and Regional Leadership.

Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

May, 1972

PART I

ADMINISTRATORS REACT TO MANAGEMENT CONCEPTS

Until a few years ago, there existed a relative absence of management concepts in the literature of higher education administration due in part to an attitude that higher education should not be compared with private enterprise. The combination of external pressures for improved accountability and internal pressures for improved communication and greater participation in the decision-making process has prompted a re-examination by many administrators of the relevance of management concepts to the operation of institutions of higher education.

This paper describes the reactions of a group of administrators of independent and public two-year colleges who participated in a management institute during the summer of 1971. An attempt was made to get an immediate reaction to the presentation of management concepts on the final day of the institute with particular emphasis upon predicting changes that might be implemented as a consequence of the institute. A follow-up evaluation was conducted five months later to determine whether any change had actually occurred as perceived by the respondents.

The Institute

The Management Institute was sponsored by the Southeastern Community College Leadership Program of the Florida State University and the University of Florida supported by a grant of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and with the assistance of the American Association of Junior Colleges and the National Council of Independent Junior Colleges. It was a departure from previous summer institutes sponsored by the S.C.C.L.P. in several ways.

First, there was a deliberate effort to accommodate the administrative leadership of independent junior colleges as well as public community colleges during the planning of the institute and in the selection of program staff for group sessions. The cooperation of the American Association of Junior Colleges enabled the Southeastern Community College Leadership Program to broaden the scope of the institute and the geographic area served.

Another significant departure from previous institutes involved the invitation of administrative teams from the participating institutions made up of the president and one or more of his administrative staff. This was done to offer administrative teams an opportunity to examine management concepts together in a relaxed environment different from the context of the normal working situation.

The institute, held at Appalachian State University in Boone, North Carolina, was attended by sixty-four participants from

twenty institutions, ten public and ten independent. All of the public institutions were from the Southeastern states extending from Virginia to Mississippi. The ten independent colleges, all members of the AAJC National Council of Independent Junior Colleges, came from a geographic area extending from Maine to Iowa. Participants other than presidents were made up of approximately equal numbers of instructional, student personnel and business officers. The special areas of development, institutional research and computer services were also represented. Three presidents and seven second-echelon administrators were women, all from the independent colleges.

The sixty-four participants were divided into four groups for discussion and problem solving sessions. Two of the groups were made up of independent college administrators while the other two were made up of the public administrators. In order to encourage open participation and feedback from discussions, teams from individual institutions were divided and assigned to different groups whenever possible. This enabled a team to have an overview of more than one group when it met during free time at the institute or upon returning home. It also helped to prevent distortions in expression of views because of the perceived or actual domination of an institutional leader.

The Institute Format

The format of the institute provided for selected management

concepts to be presented in a series of reinforcement patterns. Initially a concept was introduced and discussed in general session with particular care to consider the similarities for application in the academic and business setting. Then, a film or transparencies depicting analysis and application of the principle or concept was presented. Following this presentation, discussion occurred within the four smaller groups with special consideration of the different circumstances of independent and public institutions. As additional reinforcement, printed literature was distributed for the participants to study for the discussion in small group sessions and to encourage application of the concepts in the institutional setting. Finally, a simulation problem was distributed to the discussion groups to provide an opportunity for using the concept in proposed policy formulation. Following small group consideration of each problem, a final reporting and discussion session was held for the entire group.

Selected Concepts Considered

Prior to consideration of specific management concepts, the Management Style Diagnosis Test[1] was administered to each of the institute participants. While the items utilized business terminology, individuals were able to relate the style profiles to their personal characteristics and to the institutions they served. Neither the test nor the profiles were discussed in detail initially since they were intended to stimulate self-analysis and responsive-

ness to new concepts. This aspect of the workshop induced a significant level of anxiety in some participants and furnished a solid motivation for exploring the concepts underlying patterns of human relationships in the work setting. Personal styles of management as well as human interrelationships theory complemented analysis of organization structure and lines of communication theory.

The first concept examined in depth was the human motivation theory of Abraham H. Maslow[2] with emphasis upon his hierarchy of human needs. The second concept explored was the contribution of Douglas M. McGregor[3] who used Maslow's work as the basis of a theory of human behavior related to organizational objectives, including his Theory X and Theory Y propositions.

Management styles as classified by Blake and Mouton[4] provided a third topic along with the three-dimensional concept developed by Reddin[5] which related back to the Management Style Diagnosis Test administered at the beginning of the institute. Participants were able to examine the Managerial Grid developed by Blake and Mouton as well as the three-dimensional graphics developed by Reddin.

The research of Rensis Likert[6] into the motivation of workers under different organizational systems was also considered. The institute participants were able to rate their own institutions on a profile encompassing the categories of leadership, motivation,

decisions, communication, goals, and feedback. Of particular interest to the participants was the motivation hygiene theory of Frederick Herzberg[7].

The Surveys

The questions of most immediate concern to the writers involved were: (1) the extent to which institute participants would consider management concepts appropriate for the academic setting, and (2) the extent to which participants would actually attempt to apply some of the concepts at their own institution. A corollary concern, of interest to planners of in-service programs, was the question of how meaningful short-term institutes actually are to participants. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation, for example, has supported short-term in-service activities of many universities and of the American Association of Junior Colleges for over a decade. Evidence of carry-over effects of such programs would be of great interest to such organizations.

The first evaluation form, administered during the last session of the institute, consisted of seven statements to be rated along a five point scale("Strongly Agree", "Agree", "Uncertain", "Disagree", "Strongly Disagree"). Participants were invited to add comments for each of the items as well. In addition, they were asked to identify what they perceived as the highlights and shortcomings of the Institute.

The follow-up evaluation form, mailed five months later to

each of the participants, contained five statements matched with the first form designed to be rated along the same point scale. Several additional questions were included to assist the Southeastern Community College Leadership Program in planning its 1972 program. The second evaluation asked for identification of the respondent while the first evaluation was anonymous. A two-week deadline was set for returns. Forty replies were received within the time limit. It was considered unnecessary to make any special effort to increase the nearly two-thirds response for purposes of this study.

In order to report the results, the five rating categories have been condensed to three ("Agreed", "Uncertain", "Disagreed") and to facilitate comparison, percentages have been used in place of raw scores. The first two items centered upon the individual.

Item 1: "As a result of the Institute, your perception of your own management style increased."

First Response: 88% Agreed of 63 responses
Follow-up: 93% Agreed of 40 respondents

Item 2: "This Institute stimulated you to consider further study of governance and administrative theories."

First Response: 85% Agreed 10% Uncertain 5% Disagreed
Follow-up: "You have conducted further study":
70% Agreed 5% Uncertain 25% Disagreed

Note: A majority of those who disagreed added a comment stating that time limitations or pressures of immediate problems had negated their intent to do further study.

Analysis of the comments made in conjunction with the ratings revealed nearly one of every ten reported having been exposed to

management concepts previously. Several felt the institute "provided strong positive reinforcement and clarification." Management styles was viewed as a new concept by more than half of those who made comments. Three second echelon administrators reported on the follow-up that they had registered for management courses at universities during the fall as a consequence of the institute.

The last three items focused upon changes which were anticipated to take place within the institution.

Item 3: "As a consequence of this Institute, you anticipate making some administrative changes next year."

First Response:	57% Agreed	30% Uncertain	13% Disagreed
Follow-up:	"You made administrative changes":		
	50% Agreed	25% Uncertain	25% Disagreed

Item 4: "As a consequence of this Institute, you anticipate making changes in working relationships with administrators, faculty, and staff next year."

First Response:	70% Agreed	20% Uncertain	10% Disagreed
Follow-up:	"You did change working relationships":		
	78% Agreed	8% Uncertain	14% Disagreed

Item 5: "As a consequence of this Institute, you anticipate making changes in working relationships with students next year":

First Response:	58% Agreed	30% Uncertain	12% Disagreed
Follow-up:	"You did change working relationships":		
	63% Agreed	24% Uncertain	13% Disagreed

Analysis of the comments for the three items concerning change within the institution revealed a strong interest in improving inter-personal relationships within and among all three internal constituencies....students, faculty, and administrators. Governance

structure as a means of motivating involvement of greater scope and degree was noted in nearly one-fifth of the written comments. In the follow-up survey, respondents were about equally divided between those who emphasized concerns focused upon management styles and organizational theories and those who emphasized concerns focused upon concepts of inter-human relationships, motivation and sensitivity training.

While the anonymous nature of the first evaluation made comparison of individual responses over the time period impossible, those forms were keyed to identify responses from independent administrators and responses from public administrators. The follow-up evaluation also enabled a comparison between independent and public responses as well as analysis of the various administrator groups and of replies from a specific institution.

There was little appreciable difference in overall response on the basis of institutional sponsorship. Administrators of independent institutions as a group made more comments on their reply forms than did public administrators. Presidents of independent institutions tended to be more cautious in their responses than did their counterparts in that they did not use the category of "Strongly Agree" or "Strongly Disagree" for a single response whereas 30 per cent of the public presidents used that rating category. Independent administrators as a group evidenced searching thoughtful efforts to learn more about management concepts and to

find concrete applicability from such study to the academic setting. They also were consistent in suggesting future institute planning provide more time for administrators to share experiences with those who have sought application of management concepts to the operation of the two-year college.

Presidents, both independent and public, tended to give stronger emphasis to the first two items involving management style and self-analysis than did the other administrators. They were more cautious, however, in predicting changes in administrative organization and in relationships with students, faculty or other administrators as reflected in Items 3, 4, and 5.

Examination of replies from individual institutions did not evidence significant contrasts among members of administrative teams. There appeared to be general agreement as to degree of change as a consequence of the institute. Four institutions reported specific activities or discussion sessions presently enforced since the Institute in which the administrative team members exchange views and experience on inter-personal relations, motivation, and goal setting. On the other hand, one president felt the institute had been "a waste of time" and "of no value" to him. Interestingly, members of his administrative team claimed to have gained much personal insight into management concepts but reported no administrative or inter-personal relationship changes had taken place in their institution.

Highlights of the institute as perceived by the respondents were the management concepts explored and the opportunity for administrative teams to be together. It was felt closer relationships developed among members of a team because of the opportunity to associate outside the formal day to day working relationship.

The major shortcoming of the institute reported was the use of simulated case studies. Perhaps the major difficulty of this approach was the content of the studies rather than the technique. Nevertheless, there was significant feeling that this element of the institute had been irrelevant or unrealistic.

Conclusions

Two-year college administrators are interested in and receptive to management concepts in seeking ways to strengthen the operation of their institutions. Furthermore, they do attempt to apply procedures and practices thus identified to their own situation when there is a firm basis for expecting positive results.

Another conclusion drawn from the institute is the value of participation of administrative teams in summer workshops or institutes. This might be an important consideration for presidents developing plans and budgets for staff development.

An important conclusion planners of professional development projects should note is the value of developing programs of mutual concern and interest to independent and public administrators alike. A real benefit accrues when the two groups work and relax together.

REFERENCES

1. Reddin, W. J., Management Style Diagnosis Test, Fredricton, N. B.: Organizational Tests, Ltd., 1970.

2. Maslow, A. H., Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.

3. McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.

4. Blake, Robert Rogers and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid: Key Orientations for Achieving Production Through People. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964.

5. Reddin, W. J., Managerial Effectiveness, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1970.

6. Likert, Rensis, The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1967.

7. Herzberg, Frederick, "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" Harvard Business Review, January-February, 1968.

PART II

MOTIVATION IN THE MANAGEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

There is increasing acceptance of the need to apply management concepts to higher education administration. The growing size and complexity of colleges and universities create patterns of relationships similar in significant respects to industrial enterprises while state systems share many of the characteristics of conglomerate organizations. Management by objectives is under careful scrutiny by many less traditional administrators while those faculty, open to change, are experimenting with the use of behavioral objectives. Many patriarch prophets continue to regard the application of industrial research to the administration of higher education as heresy. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of many such concepts suggests the age old transformation of heresy to doctrine may soon be upon us. This paper will briefly review several motivation theories which offer significant promise to improve the operation of our institutions, services to students and rewards to faculty, staff, administration.

The historical definition found throughout management literature is: "Management Is Getting Things Done Through Other People". The implied notion of this definition is one of manipulation which

is repugnant to the educator who conjures an image of exploitation of man and machine for profit. Yet students of management have maintained a constant quest to learn how humans work best and what is required to get things done through or by people. From this effort significant change has occurred in management theory which has applicability for colleges and universities.

A more definitive description of management has evolved from the American Management Association. It is: "Management is Guiding Human and Physical Resources into Dynamic Organization Units that Attain their Objectives to the Satisfaction of those Served and with a High Degree of Morale and Sense of Attainment on the Part of those Rendering the Service". From this definition it is possible to think of the students and society as those served and to think of faculty, staff, and administrators as those rendering the service. Requisites can be identified by analyzing some of the key words in the description. Objectives require planning while attainment to the satisfaction of those served requires output measurement or accountability. Dynamic organization units implies the need for flexibility and responsiveness to ever changing circumstances, a condition that confronts every educational institution. Fundamental to the longer definition, however, is the concept of motivation. How are people guided to achieve the desired objective to the satisfaction of those served? How can the organization provide them with a sense of attainment and a high degree of morale?

The word motivation means "to move." Perhaps the most influen-

tial of the human motivation theorists was Abraham H. Maslow.[1] Maslow's hierarchy of basic needs is now generally accepted as a cornerstone to management theory whether in business or educational administration. His heirarchy ranges from the basic physiological needs of food, water, shelter, and exercise to higher level safety needs, the need for belonging and love, the ego need for self-esteem, and at the apex, the need for self actualization. Important to his theory is the concept that individuals seek to fulfill higher level needs as lower level needs are satisfied, or in the process of being satisfied. If man is hungry and without food, he is not concerned about his ego or whether he will make a great contribution to mankind; but when he has the comforts of home and a secure income, he needs recognition as well as self satisfaction in his work. An interesting aspect of Maslow's theory held that satisfied needs are no longer motivators for behavior. Industrial psychologists have used Maslow's theory to explain such seeming paradoxes as why well paid employees under excellent working conditions sometimes sabotaged the very product they were paid to produce. The Hawthorne studies revealed that peer group acceptance could constitute a more significant need than salary increases for employees whose basic physiological needs were met. Thus in working with people, we have come to appreciate their higher level needs for recognition and self-esteem as these contribute to self confidence, and self worth; a condition necessary to

achieve Maslow's highest level of need of self-actualization, the process of becoming all one is capable of being.

Maslow's work provided the basis for additional investigations which have provided further insight into the nature of human motivation and its implications for the management of any human enterprise, including higher education. Moving from what motivates an individual to the question of what motivates a unit or organization of people, we discover a significant shift occurring in the perception of man and his relationship to work.

Douglas M. McGregor[2] used Maslow's work as the basis of a theory of human behavior related to organizational objectives. He postulated two contexts within which management might view human behavior. The traditional point of view equated human resources with natural resources. They were to be harnessed, directed, and used as tools of management to achieve desired goals or objectives. From this assumption, there can be developed a set of propositions or assumptions which he labeled Theory X. Under this theory the function of management is to direct, motivate, control or modify human behavior to fit the needs of the organization. People by nature are not expected to be interested in the achievement of objectives without management's active intervention. Theory X managers view man as naturally lazy, irresponsible, self-centered, resistant to change but capable of being duped to produce in spite of these characteristics if management has the wisdom to engineer

organizational structures or individual incentives to force the worker to produce.

An opposite set of assumptions about human behavior based on Maslow's work leads to management which McGregor described as Theory Y. The Theory Y manager views people as goal-oriented and motivated through satisfaction of achievement. Hence, rather than external motivation being the prime mover, it is the internal self-motivation that man strives to satisfy as his basic physiological needs are met and he seeks to fulfill higher level psychological needs. Viewed in the Theory Y context, management needs to provide opportunities through which the individual can help to define his own objectives within the scope of organizational objectives. In this way, the individual becomes more self-directing rather than management-directed. Furthermore, through involvement in the evaluation process the individual knows the goals established and the progress toward achieving them. It can be demonstrated that Theory Y assumptions undergird many contemporary academic instructional strategies in addition to the employer-employee relationship addressed by McGregor.

Adding additional perspective to the theories of Maslow and McGregor, Frederick Herzberg has developed a motivation-hygiene theory.[3] Herzberg modifies Maslow's concept of the intent to which needs can be met and thus cease to be motivators. He postulates that lower needs are cyclical in nature, recurring on a predictable

schedule with a constantly accelerating level required to prevent dissatisfaction. Therefore he maintains it is necessary to differentiate those environmental conditions such as wages, fringe benefits, working conditions or policies and interpersonal relationships which he calls "Hygiene Factors" from "Motivators". Herzberg defines the motivators as those factors having to do with what the individual does---the higher level needs of belonging, self-esteem, and self-actualization as they are reflected in achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. He postulates that motivators leading to job satisfaction are distinct and separate from hygiene factors which lead to job dissatisfaction. He also suggests the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction but rather the absence of job dissatisfaction. Thus improvement of working conditions or salary and benefits will not change dissatisfaction to satisfaction but rather remove dissatisfaction.

By distinguishing hygiene from motivational factors, it is possible to differentiate the extrinsic from the intrinsic nature of motivation. Extrinsic motivation may be viewed as the outside sources of reward and punishment to keep people moving. This represents the "carrot and stick" group of considerations related to Theory X assumptions that people are basically lazy, need external direction and must be forced to produce.

The intrinsic motivators are those "built in" to the people

by the opportunities afforded for higher level needs to be satisfied. Theory Y assumptions set the stage for the individual to identify his objectives within the context of the organizational goals in order for him to derive satisfaction from his own productivity. Intrinsic motivators lead to loyalty and high morale, a fundamental part of the concept of management.

Institutions of higher education have experienced many of the dysfunctional consequences associated with the adversary posture of "labor and management" in recent years. Rapidly changing perceptions of the roles of students, faculty and administrators have forced a reexamination of earlier practices. The student role can no longer be expected to be passive and quiescent. Faculty can no longer be expected to acquiesce to unpopular decisions because of "professional loyalty" to the institution, and administrators can no longer expect that authority and power can be held or delegated on the basis of job descriptions or Board edicts.[4]

Opportunity for individuals to participate in the determination and evaluation of their work tasks, whether student, faculty or administrator, will foster greater instrinsic motivation. Much remains to be done if the institution is to enable each individual to progress toward his own higher level needs while contributing to the attainment of institutional goals.

Study of management theory of organization, of leadership, of

communication, of planning, and of evaluation can add to the skills of the higher education administrator interested in achieving his higher level needs thus changing his practice into more of a science and less of an art.

MANAGEMENT IS GUIDING HUMAN AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES INTO DYNAMIC ORGANIZATION UNITS THAT ATTAIN THEIR OBJECTIVES TO THE SATISFACTION OF THOSE SERVED AND WITH A HIGH DEGREE OF MORALE AND SENSE OF ATTAINMENT ON THE PART OF THOSE RENDERING THE SERVICE.

REFERENCES

1. Maslow, A. H., Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.

2. McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.

3. Herzberg, Frederick, "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" Harvard Business Review, January-February, 1968.

4. Richardson, Richard C. Jr., Clyde E. Blocker, and Louis W. Bender, Governance for the Two-Year College New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

PART III

MANAGEMENT STYLES AMONG TWO-YEAR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS

A significant body of literature has accumulated suggesting the need to analyze role perceptions of college administrators as these may relate to administrative effectiveness. In a recent issue of the Junior College Journal, Upton emphasized the need for leadership training for community college administrators as a way of reducing role conflict.[1] In the same issue, one of the writers of this paper suggested resistance to role change as a primary factor in the failure of many of our institutions to maintain satisfactory human relationships among institutional constituencies.[2]

The major barrier to effective analysis has been the absence of standardized instruments for use in identifying the dimensions of role perceptions as well as the lack of a theoretical framework within which studies could be carried out. As a consequence, the efforts of scholars have been diffuse and speculative offering little in the way of direction to practicing administrators.

Industrial psychologists have identified a number of promising directions which ought to be explored more completely by theorists in educational administration. The purpose of this paper is to trace briefly one set of assumptions that have been used effectively

in research and management training in industry and to report the results of using this technique with a group of two-year college administrators.

Blake and Mouton[3] developed a scheme for analyzing managerial behavior on the basis of concern for people as compared with concern for getting the job done. Their managerial grid is composed of two intersecting axes each numbered from 1 - 9 with the higher numbers corresponding to increased concern. While this makes possible 81 different combinations, the authors discuss 5 categories in some detail. The 1,9 manager, for example, is an individual with high concern for people but very limited concern for the task. A 9,9 administrator has high concern for both people and the task and theoretically should function with a high degree of efficiency. The concepts of Blake and Mouton are obviously helpful in understanding organizational dynamics. Investigators have long puzzled over the low relationships between morale and productivity. Viewed in the context of 1,9 management, it is apparent that one of the reasons morale may be high is because little is required of the employee in the interests of maintaining congenial relationships.

Reddin has moved beyond the concepts of Blake and Mouton in an attempt to analyze and integrate the findings of management theorists during the past decade.[4] His 3-dimensional theory of management introduces the plane of effectiveness to the managerial grid. Reddin rejects the idea that one particular style of manage-

ment can be more effective than another for all organizations under all circumstances. Instead, he integrates emphasis upon people (Relationships Orientation) and emphasis upon the task (Task Orientation) within a situational context. By projecting the plane formed by the (RO) and (TO) axes into a third dimension, which he labels Effectiveness he defines eight rather than five categories for analyzing managerial behavior. These categories have been defined as follows:

Deserter Low concern for relationships and low concern for the task under inappropriate circumstances. Less effective behavior perceived as uninvolved, passive or negative. Similar to managerial grid 1,1.

Missionary High concern for relationships and low concern for the task under inappropriate circumstances. Less effective behavior emphasizing harmony. Similar to managerial grid 1,9.

Autocrat Low concern for relationships and high concern for the task under inappropriate circumstances. Less effective behavior emphasizing performance. Similar to managerial grid 9,1.

Compromiser High concern for relationships and high concern for the task under circumstances that require either one or neither. Less effective behavior emphasizing short term solutions at the expense of long range objectives. Similar to managerial grid 5,5.

Bureaucrat Low concern for relationships and low concern for the task in an appropriate setting. More effective behavior main-

taining the organization through conscientious observance of regulations. No comparable position on managerial grid.

Developer High concern for relationships and low concern for the task under appropriate circumstances. More effective behavior emphasizing the development of individuals through trust and confidence. No comparable position on managerial grid.

Benevolent Autocrat Low concern for relationships and high concern for the task under appropriate circumstances. More effective behavior emphasizing performance without creating resentment. No comparable position on managerial grid.

Executive High concern for relationships and high concern for the task under appropriate circumstances. More effective behavior emphasizing high performance, team effort, and the importance of individuals. Similar to managerial grid 9,9.

Four of the styles: Deserter, Missionary, Autocrat, and Compromiser are considered less effective because they involve the use of levels of relationships orientation and task orientation inappropriate to the situational context. The other four styles: Bureaucrat, Developer, Benevolent Autocrat, and Executive are considered more effective. Table 1 provides a summary of the eight styles and their relationships to each other. Each of the more effective styles may be equally effective depending upon the circumstances surrounding its use.

TABLE 1

Reddin's Management Styles

Less Effective	More Effective	RO	TO	Situation
Deserter		Low	Low	Inappropriate
	Bureaucrat	Low	Low	Appropriate
Missionary		High	Low	Inappropriate
	Developer	High	Low	Appropriate
Autocrat		Low	High	Inappropriate
	Benevolent Autocrat	Low	High	Appropriate
Compromiser		High	High	Inappropriate
	Executive	High	High	Appropriate

Management Style Diagnosis Test

Reddin has used the 3D theory to develop the Management Style Diagnosis Test.[5] This instrument consists of sixty-four pairs of statements designed to force the individual to select from among each pair the statement which best describes the way he behaves in his job environment. The statements were selected by judges as representative of one of the eight management styles previously defined. Statements representative of a particular style may be chosen a maximum of fifteen times or a minimum of once. Adjustments are made to the raw scores yielding a profile for each individual with adjusted scores of eleven or more representing a dominant style

and scores of ten representing a supporting style.

In addition to style profiles, the test also yields scores for task orientation, relationships orientation, effectiveness, and a style synthesis. The style synthesis which is derived from the use of the (TO), (RO), and (E) scores may not be the same as the dominant style. While the test is intended primarily as a management training tool, it has also been used for research purposes to compare the role perceptions of a variety of management groups.

The greatest weakness of the instrument is the measurement of effectiveness. This weakness is acknowledged by the author. Since the test does not incorporate any data relative to the situational context of the administrator tested, it is difficult to see how the authors' claims for the measurement of more effective or less effective behavior related to circumstances can be sustained. The test also forces the individual in some instances to choose between statements which may be equally objectionable. Under such forced choice, selections may be spurious.

Since the test is designed for the industrial setting, the circumstances presented and the terminology used are not always appropriate for the educational context. Despite these weaknesses, the writers found the test useful in the educational setting both for purposes of research and for professional development. The amount of introspection induced in the educational administrator who discovers that his dominant style is classified as less effective

provides an excellent starting point for critical self-analysis and change. The ease with which the test can be administered and the self-scoring format also contribute to the instrument's value.

Management Style of Two-Year College Administrators

During the summer of 1971, the presidents of two-year colleges who had recently been appointed to their posts, along with key members of their administrative staffs, were invited to attend a management institute sponsored by Florida State University and the University of Florida with the support of a W. K. Kellogg Foundation grant. The institute was attended by administrative teams from twenty institutions with a total of sixty-four participants. Half of the institutions represented were public institutions including both small single campus colleges as well as large multi-campus institutions. Administrators other than presidents included, in approximately equal numbers, student personnel deans, instructional deans, and business officers. In addition there were five administrators representing the special areas of development, computer services and institutional research. All of the thirty-two public college administrators were male. Three preseidents and seven second echelon administrators from the independent colleges were women.

On the first day of the institute prior to the presentation of

any material, all participants were asked to complete the Management Style Diagnosis Test. The use of the instrument was intended to serve four purposes: to motivate the participants to analyze their own role perceptions and to relate such perceptions to the information presented during the institute; to permit a comparison between the perceptions of educational administrators enrolled in the institute and the perceptions of other occupational groupings reported by Reddin; to compare the role perceptions of those selected as presidents of independent (private) or public two-year colleges with the perceptions of their second echelon staff; and to compare the perceptions of independent (private) two-year college administrators with their counterparts from public institutions.

Because Reddin reports comparative data on the basis of Style Synthesis rather than dominant and supporting styles, the first step in the analysis of the data was to construct the Style Synthesis by category for individuals completing the test as well as a composite style synthesis for the entire group. Table 2 presents this information. Care should be taken in interpreting the significance of the differences which appear since the Style Synthesis is less valid than dominant and supporting styles which have been used for statistical analysis.

The Style Synthesis for 70% of the total group was either Missionary or Developer, both involving high relationships orienta-

TABLE 2

STYLE SYNTHISIS OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
BY LEVEL AND CONTROL

Management Style	Presidents				Other Admin.				Total	
	Public		Private		Public		Private			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Deserter	1	11	0		1	4	2	9	4	6
Missionary	1	11	6	60	7	30	9	41	23	36
Autocrat	0		0		1	4	2	9	3	5
Compromiser	0		0		1	4	3	14	4	6
Bureaucrat	0		0		1	4	0		1	2
Developer	4	44	4	40	8	35	6	27	22	34
Benevolent Autocrat	0		0		2	9	0		2	3
Executive	3	33	0		2	9	0		5	8
Total	9	99	10	100	23	99	22	100	64	100

tion and low task orientation. All but one of the presidents of both public and independent two-year colleges perceived their role as high on the (RO) dimension. Public college presidents more frequently exhibited a Style Synthesis combining high (TO) with high (RO) than independent college presidents, as evidenced by the number having the Style Synthesis of Executive. Since all presidents were newly appointed, one hypothesis that might be explored is the extent a high (RO) is a prerequisite for selection to this position. It is also interesting to note that 7 of 9 public college presidents were classified as using the more effective styles while this was true for only 4 of 10 of the independent college presidents. Similar trends appeared among second echelon administrators with 13 of 23 having the more effective Style Synthesis in comparison with 6 of 22 for independent college administrators. The heavy emphasis upon management styles with high (RO) is again apparent among second echelon administrators although a much broader style dispersion is evident at this level.

As a matter of interest, the Style Synthesis of business officers was examined to determine what they contributed to the style dispersion. Among the combined groups there were 9 in this category. Only 3 of the 9 had a Style Synthesis with a high (RO). The business officers included: 2 Deserters, 2 Autocrats, 1 Bureaucrat, 1 Benevolent Autocrat, 2 Developers, and 1 Executive.

It would appear that the test may distinguish among role perceptions of sub-groups among administrators and that the perceptions of business officers in this group, if replicated among institutions in general, could help to explain the frequent communication problems reported by faculty and students in working with the business officer. One suggestion for further research would involve an assessment of the impact of an administrator with a Style Synthesis having low (RO) in an institution where most administrators were high in this area.

A second concern of the investigators was the comparison of the Style Synthesis for educational administrators with those reported for other groups by Reddin. Table 3 provides this information. The college administrator along with research and development managers were the only two groups to exhibit a preponderance of less effective styles, with 53% and 58% respectively. Not surprisingly these are also the only two groups whose efforts involve primarily the supervision of professionals. These findings again raise questions concerning the validity of the effectiveness dimensions of the test. The industrial bias of the instrument may result in a definition of effectiveness which is not entirely appropriate to the supervision of professionals.

It is clear from our analysis of Table 2 that management styles with high (RO) predominate among the administrators attending

TABLE 3

A COMPARISON OF THE STYLE SYNTHESIS OF
COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS WITH SELECTED GROUPINGS BY PERCENTAGES

Management Style	2 Year College Admin.	Heads of Volunteer Agencies	Research & Development Managers
Deserter	6	5	15
Missionary	36	11	15
Autocrat	5	9	15
Compromiser	6	9	13
Bureaucrat	2	5	3
Developer	34	41	27
Benevolent Autocrat	3	11	6
Executive	8	9	6
	n=62	n=59	n=62

	Military Officers Lt.Col.Rank	Presidents & Vice Presidents Single Conglomerate
Deserter	2	6
Missionary	1	3
Autocrat	15	15
Compromiser	12	9
Bureaucrat	8	0
Developer	10	6
Benevolent Autocrat	20	12
Executive	32	49
	n=73	n=33

the institute with the trend even more pronounced among the presidents. A comparison of the percentages of each group exhibiting a Style Synthesis of one of the four styles having high (RO) reported in Table 3 reveals that 84% of the educational administrators fell into this category compared with 70% for the Heads of Volunteer Agencies, 67% for Presidents and Vice Presidents of a Single Conglomerate, 61% for Research and Development Managers and 55% for Military Officers, Lt. Col. Rank. The emphasis upon (RO) in the educational enterprise is unmistakable. Given this orientation, the key question becomes one of how concern for relationships can be most effectively combined with the need to carry out defined missions.

Style Synthesis is a useful tool for formulating hypotheses and for comparing occupational groups. The writers were interested in addition in determining which, if any, of the differences exhibited by administrators in the institute might be significant. The method of treatment selected was analysis of variance of the adjusted raw scores by style category for three sub-groups.

Table 4 provides the results for independent college presidents in comparison with other independent college administrators attending the institute. Two significant differences appeared. Independent two-year college presidents were less likely to select statements representative of the category of Autocrat at the 1% level of confidence. They were less likely to select

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE PRESIDENTS
IN COMPARISON WITH OTHER INDEPENDENT COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS

Management Style	Mean Score		Mean Square		F
	Presidents	Other Admin.	Between	Within	
Deserter	7.80	7.00	4.40	2.19	2.01
Missionary	11.20	10.32	5.34	1.95	2.75
Autocrat	5.80	7.64	23.18	2.16	10.75**
Compromiser	7.60	8.95	12.61	2.64	4.77*
Bureaucrat	8.30	8.14	0.18	2.16	0.09
Developer	10.40	9.23	9.45	5.21	1.82
Benevolent Autocrat	6.90	7.14	0.38	3.45	0.11
Executive	8.00	7.73	0.51	2.81	0.18

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

statements representative of the category of Compromiser at the 5% level of confidence. The mean dominant style for independent college presidents was Missionary. The mean supporting style was Developer. Other independent college administrators did not display a mean dominant style. The mean supporting style was Missionary.

Table 5 presents the same comparisons for public college administrators. There were no significant differences between presidents and other administrators. Presidents displayed no mean dominant style and a double mean supporting style of Developer and Missionary. Other public college administrators displayed a single mean support style of Missionary, although as previously noted the differences between the two groups in these categories are not sufficiently great to have been caused by anything other than chance.

Table 6 provides a comparison between independent and public two-year college administrators. Independent college administrators were significantly less likely to select statements representative of the category of Benevolent Autocrat at the 1% level or confidence. Both independent and private college administrators demonstrated a mean supporting style of Missionary.

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PUBLIC COLLEGE PRESIDENTS
IN COMPARISON WITH OTHER PUBLIC COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS

Management Style	Mean Score		Mean Square		F
	Presidents	Other Admin.	Between	Within	
Deserter	5.78	6.74	5.98	3.07	1.95
Missionary	10.11	10.13	0.00	2.52	0.00
Autocrat	7.33	7.52	0.23	3.66	0.06
Compromiser	8.00	7.96	0.01	2.17	0.01
Bureaucrat	7.33	7.75	1.06	3.48	0.31
Developer	10.33	9.30	6.85	3.56	1.92
Benevolent Autocrat	8.33	8.39	0.02	4.25	0.01
Executive	8.78	8.17	2.36	2.23	1.06

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS IN COMPARISON WITH PUBLIC COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS

Management Style	Mean Score		Mean Square		F
	Private	Public	Between	Within	
Deserter	7.25	6.47	9.77	2.71	3.61
Missionary	10.59	10.13	3.51	2.25	1.56
Autocrat	7.06	7.47	2.64	3.19	0.83
Compromiser	8.53	7.97	5.06	2.53	2.00
Bureaucrat	8.19	7.63	5.06	2.75	1.84
Developer	9.59	9.59	0.00	4.51	0.00
Benevolent Autocrat	7.06	8.38	27.56	3.73	7.39*
Executive	7.81	8.34	4.51	2.49	1.82

*Significant at the .01 level

Conclusions

Based on our experience with the Management Style Diagnosis Test we would offer the following conclusions. First, the test is a useful device for motivating self-analysis in connection with management training programs for educational administrators. Despite an industrial bias and terminology, administrators found the test helpful in contributing to an analysis of role perceptions. Second, while it is interesting to speculate about the differences that may exist among public and independent two-year college administrators with respect to attitudes about administrative role, there is little statistical evidence to support the existence of such differences among the administrators who attended this institute. To the contrary, it would appear that with very limited exceptions the rule is similarity in administrative role perceptions. Our cursory examination of one sub-group, business officers, suggests that it would be useful for researchers to pursue the role perceptions of administrative sub-groups and the impact of such perceptions on institutional functioning.

Third, there are differnces in the Style Synthesis patterns of educational administrators when compared with other occupational groups with the former more likely to elect a style with high (RO). The significance of such differences could not be ascertained because of the nature of the data available on other occupational

groups. It is worth noting that the composite style profile for educational administrators bears a very close relationship to the profile Reddin describes as typical for managers in training functions.

Fourth, there are significant differences in the Style Profiles of the presidents of independent two-year colleges and their second echelon administrators and between public and independent two-year college administrators who attended this institute. Finally, there is a need for additional research on the effect of role perceptions on administrative effectiveness. In this regard, the 3D Theory and the Management Style Diagnosis Test offer significant possibilities for describing administrative behavior more precisely and for establishing cause and effect relationships between role perceptions and faculty and student attitudes.

REFERENCES

1. Upton, John H., "Role Conflict and Faculty Confidence in Leadership," Junior College Journal, Vol. 41 February, 1971, p. 31.

2. Richardson, Richard C. Jr., "Restructuring the Human Dimensions of Our Colleges," Junior College Journal, Vol. 41 February, 1971, p. 20.

3. Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid: Key Orientations for Achieving Production Through People. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964.

4. Reddin, William J., Managerial Effectiveness, New York: McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1970.

5. Reddin, William J., Management Style Diagnosis Test, Fredicton, N. B.: Organizational Tests, Ltd., 1968.

The Florida State University
College of Education
Department of Higher Education

Russell P. Kropp
Head

Faculty

Louis W. Bender. B.A., M.A., Ed.D. (Lehigh). Professor of Higher Education. Specialist in community/junior colleges and state level coordination.

Gerald P. Burns. B.S., M.A., Ed.D. (Columbia). Professor of Higher Education. Specialist in organization, administration, and finance of colleges and universities.

Marshall W. Hamilton. B.S., M.A., Ed.D. (Florida State). Professor of Higher Education. Specialist in community/junior college administration.

Melvene Draheim Hardee. B.S., M.A., Ph.D. (Chicago). Professor of Higher Education. Specialist in student personnel work in higher education.

F. Craig Johnson. B.S., M.S., Ph.D. (Wisconsin). Professor of Higher Education. Specialist in institutional research.

Russell P. Kropp. B.S. (Honor), M.A., Ed.D. (University of Illinois). Professor and Head. Specialist in higher education.

Maurice L. Litton. B.A., M.S., Ed.D. (Texas). Professor of Higher Education. Specialist in community/junior college education.

Stephen D. McClellan. B.A., M.Ed., Ph.D. (Michigan State). Assistant Professor of Higher Education. Specialist in administration in colleges and universities.

Reuben McDaniel, Jr. B.S., M.S., Ed.D. (Indiana University). Assistant Professor of Higher Education. Specialist in student personnel work in higher education.

W. Hugh Stickler. B.S., M.S., Ed.D. (Columbia). Professor of Higher Education. Specialist in higher education.